

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 607

UD 024 133

TITLE Women, Children, and Poverty in America. A Look at the Problems Facing Low-Income Families Headed by Women and at Some Current and Planned Ford Foundation Responses. A Working Paper.

INSTITUTION Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE Jan 85

NOTE 5 p.

AVAILABLE FROM Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 320 East 43 Street, New York, NY 10017.

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Economically Disadvantaged; Family Income; *Fatherless Family; Federal Programs; One Parent Family; Philanthropic Foundations; *Poverty Programs; *Private Financial Support; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; Secondary Education; Unwed Mothers; Welfare Services

IDENTIFIERS *Aid to Families with Dependent Children; *Ford Foundation

ABSTRACT

The problems facing low-income families headed by women and some current and planned Ford Foundation responses are discussed in this paper. The first section presents a general overview of the problem, with special focus on nonpayment of child support and teenage pregnancy. The debate over the Federal welfare program and other attempts to use public funding to lift women and children out of poverty is summarized. Next, the second section describes selected initiatives supported with Ford Foundation funding to improve the operation of the welfare system, to help teenage mothers and fathers to be good parents, and to persuade teenagers to delay childbearing. Future directions of the Foundation's activity in this area are also discussed. Eight statistical tables are presented, and a bibliography is included. (KH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED0254607

Women, Children, and Poverty in America

A look at the problems facing low-income families headed by women and at some current and planned Ford Foundation responses.

UD024/33

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carole E. Ilfiss
Ford Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Women, Children, and Poverty in America

A working paper from the Ford Foundation

<u>Preface</u>	3
<u>The Problem</u>	5
The AFDC Program: Solution or Part of the Problem?	9
Some Conclusions	13
<u>The Foundation's Program Initiatives</u>	15
Improving the Welfare System	16
Helping Teenage Parents and Preventing Teenage Pregnancy	24
<u>Tables</u>	39
<u>Bibliography</u>	47

Other Ford Foundation Working Papers

Too Little, Too Late: Services for Teenage Parents

Child Survival/Fair Start

Not Working: Unskilled Youth and Displaced Adults

Refugees and Migrants: Problems and Program Responses

Civil Rights, Social Justice, and Black America

Hispanics: Challenges and Opportunities (English and Spanish)

Additional copies of this report, as well as a list of other Foundation publications, may be obtained by writing to the Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 320 East 43 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

443 January 1985

Preface

An astonishingly large and increasing number of children in the United States are growing up in poverty. In 1982 some 13.1 million or about one in five children lived in poverty, making up nearly 40 percent of the poor. This represents an increase of 3.1 million children since 1979 and constitutes the highest rate of child poverty since the mid-sixties. While children in all types of families experience poverty, those growing up in families headed by women are the most disadvantaged; more than half live in poverty.

In 1935 Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the nation's basic welfare program, was established as part of the Social Security program to assist widows and children who had lost the family wage-earner. Conceived in the job-scarce years of the Depression, the program was designed to support those women at home so that they would not have to enter the job market.

Welfare is still very much with us, though any consensus about how it should be structured and what objectives it should fulfill has long since disappeared. The AFDC program now provides benefits for more and more families headed by women who are not widows, but instead are separated or divorced or have never been married. These women suffer economically and socially because they earn less than men; at the same time the demands on them as single parents are enormous. Many started having babies when they were teenagers, thus limiting even more their chances to obtain education and employment, to become economically independent, and to acquire the social and emotional maturity required for successful parenthood.

In the late 1970s the Ford Foundation decided to address the growing problem of poverty in families headed by women. The program that has been developed seeks answers to three questions. How can the resources available to the welfare system be used most effectively to help poor women and children? What kinds of assistance can help teenage parents to become self-sufficient and to be good parents? How can teenagers be persuaded and helped to delay childbearing and so

improve their chances for obtaining the education, work skills, and maturity that will allow them to form stable families?

Since the late 1970s, the Foundation has spent approximately \$20 million in its welfare and teenage pregnancy program. During the 1984-85 biennium \$7.4 million is budgeted for this program. Activities under other Foundation programs--those dealing with child survival and development, youth unemployment, minority and women's rights, and neighborhood development--also deal in part with problems of poverty in female-headed families.

This paper was written by Prudence Brown, the Foundation program officer with responsibilities in this area. It begins with a discussion of the problem of poverty in families headed by women and a summary of the debate over the welfare program and other attempts to use public funding to lift poor women and children out of poverty. The second section of the paper describes selected initiatives supported with Foundation funding to improve the operation of the welfare system, to help teenage mothers and fathers to be good parents, and to persuade teenagers to delay childbearing. The second section also briefly describes some directions the Foundation's activity in this area will take in the near future. A bibliography at the end gives sources for statistics cited in the paper and additional readings on the subjects covered.

We hope this report will help to increase public understanding of a growing social problem in the United States and encourage other funders, public as well as private, to devote more resources to programs that will help families headed by women to gain economic independence.

Susan V. Berresford
Vice President
U.S. and International
Affairs Programs

The Problem

Poverty in families headed by women is a source of increasing public concern. Almost half of the poor people in the United States live in such families. More than half of the children in female-headed families are growing up in poverty.*

Our society has yet to develop a consensus about how to provide economic assistance to poor families with children, particularly those headed by women. Few oppose the provision of a minimum standard of living for poor children. However, there is much debate about which families "deserve" assistance and about how to help mothers now receiving assistance for their children to move toward economic independence.

The number of families headed by women more than doubled between 1960 and 1982 (see Table 1, page 39). The growth of such families has been especially dramatic among blacks. In 1982, 42 percent of all black families were headed by women (in contrast to 23 percent of Hispanic families and 12 percent of white families). Almost half (47 percent) of all black children were living in female-headed families.

The number of such families is growing mainly for two reasons: more marriages are ending in divorce, and more women are having children without marrying (see Table 2, page 40). The number of children living with a divorced mother more than doubled from 1970 to 1982, while the number living with a never-married mother increased more than fourfold. In 1981, 19 percent of all babies born, almost

*The definition of poverty used in this paper is that of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, which sets the "poverty line" (differing according to family size) and adjusts this measure each year for inflation. Income used to determine a family's relationship to the poverty line includes wages; net income from self-employment; Social Security, public assistance, and other government cash transfers; property income (interest, rents, dividends, etc.); and private transfers such as pensions and alimony. Taxes paid are not subtracted from income. The Bureau of the Census does not count as income the value of such in-kind transfers as Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, and public housing. In 1983 the official poverty line for a family of four was \$10,178.

one in every five, were born to unmarried women; 12 percent of white babies, 24 percent of Hispanic babies, and 56 percent of black babies were born outside marriage. Still, many more children live in families in which the mother is divorced, separated, or widowed (9.3 million children in 1982) than in families in which the mother has never married (2.8 million children in 1982).

A family with a woman at the head is four and a half times more likely to be poor than a family that includes a married couple or one headed by a man (see Tables 3 and 4, pages 41 and 42). More than half of the black and Hispanic families headed by women are poor.

Most troubling, more than half (52.3 percent) of the 12 million children who live in families headed by women are living in poverty. Black and Hispanic children and very young children are the most vulnerable to poverty. Three out of five children under age six in white women-headed families, and three out of four of these children in black and Hispanic families, are growing up in poverty (see Table 5, page 43).

As the data above indicate, the last decade has seen a dramatic change in the composition of poor families. In 1959 about two-thirds of the poor, both black and white, were living in families headed by men. By 1982 almost half (47.5 percent) of all poor people in the United States were living in female-headed families: 40 percent of the white poor, 43 percent of the Hispanic poor, and 67 percent of the black poor were living in such families.

These families tend to be poorer than others because women face special obstacles in earning enough to support a family. Women often lack the skills for, or do not aspire to, or are excluded from the higher-paying jobs held by men. Even if women have the same or comparable jobs, they are often paid lower wages, have less job security, and get fewer opportunities for advancement. Also, women are less likely than men to hold jobs that provide health insurance and other benefits. Even if she has a full-time job, a woman may find it impossible to provide for all the needs of her family.

These restrictions on a woman's ability to earn an adequate living are complicated by two additional constraints that apply to

many women raising children alone: the probability that the father will not provide child support, and the special handicaps associated with adolescent childbearing.

Nonpayment of child support. More than half of all women bringing up a child (or children) alone do not receive any child support from the absent father. In 1981 40 percent of these women did not even receive a child-support order, and less than half of those who had obtained orders received the full amount due them (see Table 6, page 44). The women least likely to receive a child-support order are never-married and separated women, black and Hispanic women, and women without a high school education.

Legislation and action to enforce the payment of child support are complicated by a number of questions without self-evident answers. For example, what are appropriate levels of support? Should support be tied to visitation rights? How can the law best be applied? These questions are now being debated at the federal and state levels. Nonetheless, there is consensus on certain basic points. The child has a right to receive support from both parents, society should enforce this right, support should be shared equitably between the two parents, and the amount of support should be determined according to the parents' ability to pay.

Getting absent fathers to pay child support will not alone solve the problems of families headed by women. However, if all families received the support they were due, some now dependent on public support could manage without it (thus lowering public expenditures for welfare), and many might rise above the poverty level. An effective and equitable child-support system could also, in the long run, help reinforce social norms that encourage men and women both to avoid unwanted pregnancies and to assume responsibility for their children.

Handicaps caused by teenage pregnancy. Early childbearing contributes directly to the increase in the number of poor families headed by women in this country.

Pregnancy rates for teenagers have been rising steadily in recent years. Of the young women reaching age twenty at present, four in ten have had at least one pregnancy. In 1981 there were about 1.1 million teenage pregnancies. Three-quarters of these pregnancies were unintended. Nearly half of all teenage pregnancies in 1981 resulted in live births (39 percent were aborted and 13 percent ended in miscarriages). In 1980, 26.5 percent of all black babies, 19.0 percent of all Hispanic babies, and 13.5 percent of all white babies were born to teenagers.

Although the number of babies born to teenagers has declined from the high of the mid-1950s, an increasing proportion of births to teenagers take place outside of marriage. In 1980 about half of all teenage births were to unmarried mothers. The proportion for black teenage mothers was 86 percent; for Hispanic teenage mothers, 42 percent; and for white teenage mothers, 33 percent. Less than one in twenty of the babies born to unmarried mothers is placed for adoption.

Teenage mothers are extremely vulnerable to poverty, both in their teenage years and later. Many teenage mothers come from poor families, and have low levels of educational attainment. These mothers and any children born during their teenage years have more health problems than women and children born when the mother is older. Women who give birth as teenagers are likely to have more children during the course of their childbearing years than women who delay childbearing. Even if they are married when they become teenage mothers, their chances for marital stability in the teenage years are poor. For a variety of reasons, including the fact that having children young often interrupts schooling, these women's employment and earning prospects will probably be weak throughout their lives. The fathers of children born to teenagers are likely to suffer from similar economic and social disadvantages and to be less able to provide child support than other fathers.

Not all teenage mothers fit this stereotype, of course, and some escape poverty despite such handicaps. However, the fact that over half of all families receiving welfare benefits are headed by women who are or were teenage mothers is telling. The cost to society

of teenage pregnancy is large whether measured in increased expenditures for health and social services and for public assistance, or estimated in terms of the lost economic contributions teenage parents could have made had their educational and vocational choices not been limited by early childbearing.

The AFDC Program: Solution or Part of the Problem?

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), popularly called "welfare," the nation's basic support system for children in poor families headed by women, was authorized by the Social Security Act of 1935. It is seen by some as a useful, if imperfect, means of ensuring support for children who would otherwise suffer greatly from poverty. Others think its very existence encourages the creation of poor families.

The AFDC program currently provides cash benefits to about 3.7 million families, including 7.1 million children, at a cost of more than \$14 billion. Total federal assistance to the poor, including in-kind programs like food stamps and Medicaid as well as AFDC payments, cost \$60.8 billion in 1982. However, social insurance programs that benefit members of all social classes despite their income levels (such as Social Security, Medicare, and Veterans Income Security) cost the federal government \$275.7 billion in 1982. Thus, the large bulk of federal social assistance is not specifically targeted at the poor.

The federal government pays slightly more than half the total cost of AFDC; the states pay the remainder. Within broad federal guidelines, the states set eligibility standards and benefit levels. Both vary widely from state to state. For example, two-parent families in which the father is unemployed or incapacitated are eligible for AFDC benefits in only about half the states. In 1983 a single mother with two children received \$96 per month in Mississippi and \$530 per month in Vermont.

The number of families receiving AFDC benefits doubled each decade between 1947 and 1967 and again between 1967 and 1972; from 1972 it has remained fairly stable (see Table 7, page 45). The

average family receiving AFDC has two children and is headed by a woman under 30 years old. About 36 percent of the children in those families are under age six, and another 48 percent are between six and fourteen. Government surveys indicate that fathers are present in only one AFDC family out of nine, and the majority of them are disabled. About half of all families receiving AFDC are members of minorities, and more than three out of four live in metropolitan areas.

The mothers heading AFDC families are by no means a homogeneous group. One in four has never been employed, one in three has only a ninth-grade education or less, and one in six is responsible for four or more children. On the other hand, one in four is employed or looking for work, one in three has a high school degree, and four out of ten have only one child.

A study of 5,000 representative American families from 1969 to 1978 (the Michigan Panel Study of Income Dynamics) provides some insight into who receives AFDC funds and for how long. At least half the families in the study who were receiving welfare used it for only short periods (up to two years) as a temporary source of support following a divorce, a job loss, or the death of a spouse. Another one-third of the families stayed in the system for from three to eight years; some of those families combined AFDC income with income from other government sources, earnings from work, and support from family and friends, and eventually freed themselves from the need for AFDC funds. A final group of families, about one-sixth of those receiving AFDC, seemed to lack the opportunity or motivation to become more independent; they were "locked into" the system. Those long-term (eight years or more) recipients fit a familiar pattern. They were likely to be black or Hispanic, to have had their children outside marriage, to have large numbers of children, to lack a high school degree, and to have had no previous earnings (see Table 8, page 46).

Criticism of the AFDC program has come from a number of sources and perspectives. Some argue that the present welfare system is stigmatizing and dehumanizing, that it requires recipients to deal with tedious bureaucratic regulations and to tolerate invasions of privacy inappropriate for an entitlement program intended to ensure a

minimum standard of living for poor children. Others maintain that AFDC benefits do not adequately cover the basic needs of such children. Because of inflation, the real value of AFDC benefits has diminished since the mid-1970s. Even when AFDC payments are combined with food stamps, the joint value is not enough to raise a family above the poverty level in any state except Alaska.

Another group of critics believe that AFDC benefits undermine any sense of responsibility parents may have about supporting their children. They suspect that the AFDC program encourages women to have children outside of marriage so they can become eligible not only for cash assistance but also for Medicaid, subsidized housing, and other in-kind benefits that are linked to AFDC eligibility. They also suspect that present eligibility rules encourage fathers to leave their families so mothers and children can receive assistance.

Analysts of data gathered by the Michigan Panel Study of Income Dynamics dispute these criticisms. They conclude that the welfare system does not foster extensive dependency, nor does it affect rates of divorce, remarriage, or childbearing outside marriage.

Another major subject of debate concerns the relationship between work and welfare. The AFDC program was originally designed to enable women (mostly widows) to "properly" fulfill their role as mothers (which, given the scarcity of jobs in 1935, meant preventing them from working outside the home). The large-scale movement of women into the labor force over the last two decades has helped change attitudes about the extent to which women receiving AFDC benefits can and should contribute to the support of their families. However, Americans remain ambivalent about whether women with young children should be required to work. Most people, including AFDC recipients, agree that employment is preferable to welfare dependence. There is less agreement about who is employable and what policies best promote participation in the labor force.

Various strategies have been tried to put welfare recipients to work, ranging from offering training, providing financial incentives to work, and creating public service jobs to requiring recipients to seek work in order to receive benefits.

Since 1967, when Congress initiated the Work Incentive Program (WIN), welfare programs have been expected to help welfare mothers secure employment, and mothers receiving welfare who have no children under age six are required to register for training or work. Results of the WIN program have been largely disappointing for a number of reasons: a lack of available or appropriate jobs; an overemphasis on training women for jobs that do not pay enough to support a family; inadequate funding of WIN job-support services; and the special needs of many AFDC mothers, which make it difficult for them to take full advantage of training or work opportunities. Among those needs are support services like child care, transportation to training or work, courses to make up for basic deficits in education or skills, and help in handling unanticipated problems (such as car repairs, late welfare checks, and illness). Nonetheless, some training and employment initiatives for AFDC mothers have shown promising results. The challenge is to find ways that match various employment and training options (for example, job clubs, on-the-job training, and pre-employment workshops) with the diverse needs of welfare recipients, that use limited resources efficiently, and that promote, rather than undermine, the woman's confidence and desire to work.

The current Administration's approach to this goal, as embodied in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, is to strengthen work requirements. This renewed emphasis on "workfare" has stimulated reexamination of a number of questions. Which work/welfare approaches are most effective with which types of recipients? Can enough jobs be created that produce social benefits but do not displace other workers? What sanctions are appropriate if the work requirements are not met? How does the work requirement fit with the original goal of the AFDC program--to provide for the needs of poor children? The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 also reduces welfare benefits for the working poor, who are not considered among the "truly needy." Paradoxically, the result in almost half the states has been to reduce the incentive to work, since a working mother earning average wages in those states has less disposable income than the AFDC mother who does not work at all.

Some Conclusions

In this decade the number of families that include a married couple is projected to grow by 6 percent, while the number of families maintained by women is expected to grow by 26 percent. If present trends continue, a large number of the new families headed by women will be poor.

Many social analysts and policymakers believe that to reduce the number of people living in poverty significantly in the years ahead, this nation will have to make special provisions to improve the lot of families headed by women. It may also be necessary to remedy the considerable disparity in income between black and white families. The ratio of black to white family income declined from .61 to .58 between 1970 and 1980; this drop is entirely attributable to the greater increase in the number of families headed by women in the black community than in the white. The income of black families with both a husband and wife is coming close to that of white husband-wife families, while the income of black families headed by women is falling further behind that of both black and white husband-wife families. This decline is found among whites as well, but it is more serious among blacks since only 12 percent of white families (and 35 percent of poor white families) are headed by women, in contrast to 42 percent of black families (and 71 percent of poor black families).

What forms should these special provisions take? They can be preventive, aimed at keeping more female-headed families from forming, or they can be remedial, helping poor women achieve economic independence. The latter can be aimed categorically at families headed by women, or they can attack the problems these families face through more universal employment and tax policies.

It is evident that the economic status of men, especially black men, affects the number of poor families headed by women. About one-third of all families headed by women that stop receiving welfare assistance do so because the woman marries or rejoins a husband. Strengthening the earning power of black men might be one of a number of possible strategies for pulling black families headed by women out of poverty.

Finally, the evidence points to the existence of a relatively small group of families receiving AFDC whose reliance on these funds is fairly long-term. Disproportionately headed by black mothers with little education and few skills, most with young children at home, these families face significant barriers to economic self-sufficiency and may require substantial assistance over a sustained period of time if they are to achieve some measure of independence.

The Foundation's Program Initiatives

In approaching the problem of poverty in families headed by women under its welfare and teenage pregnancy program, the Ford Foundation supports projects that conform to two broad strategies, with funding roughly split between the two.

The first strategy is to explore how the public assistance this country provides poor mothers and children can be improved. Participants in the debate about welfare policy have tended to take sharply opposing positions. In recent years, however, the changes in welfare policy and funding proposed, and in some cases put into effect, by the Reagan Administration have spurred moderates of various political persuasions to look at the problem of poverty in ways that transcend traditional conservative and liberal positions. This is happening both in Congress and at the state level, where policymakers and program administrators are struggling to mount effective programs with limited resources. For example, a diverse group of policymakers has been supporting initiatives in the areas of child support and work requirements for selected welfare recipients. This emerging consensus, at least in some areas of welfare policy, has provided the Foundation with opportunities to generate new knowledge about the welfare system and to test initiatives for making it more effective.

The second strategy is to prevent the creation of families headed by adolescents, mostly women, who are likely to live in poverty. Under this strategy, the Foundation supports projects that help teens avoid pregnancy and that help teen parents escape long-term welfare dependency.

A number of other Foundation activities address various aspects of the problem of poverty in families headed by women. These include the support of programs that deal with sex discrimination in employment, comparable worth, and pension issues; promote the healthy development of infants in high-risk families; reduce school dropout and provide remedial education for out-of-school youth; help ensure the observance of civil rights; and assist the development of poor communities.

Improving the Welfare System

To date, Foundation support under this strategy has been aimed at generating knowledge to inform the debate over welfare and other social policies and programs affecting families headed by women, as well as examining in depth one important initiative--attempting to move welfare recipients into employment.

Social welfare policy research. Although policymakers disagree on how to reform the welfare system, there is a consensus on what the results of reform should be. An ideal system would reach all families in need, provide enough income to live a decent life, help recipients move toward social and economic independence, increase the incentive to work, and be efficient and simple to administer. Unfortunately, it is difficult to reconcile some of these objectives within one system--for example, providing a decent income and preserving the incentive to work. The Reagan Administration believes the use of AFDC funds to supplement earned income removes the incentive to work and tends to make recipients permanently dependent on welfare; accordingly, in 1981, subsidies for the "working poor" (those whose earned income does not bring the family above the poverty level) were discontinued. A Foundation-supported research project that studied the effects of this change provided some insight on the results.

Center for the Study of Social Policy/Columbia University/University of Michigan--In studies made by researchers at these three institutions in Georgia, Michigan, and New York City, 776 poor families headed by employed women who had lost welfare eligibility were interviewed. The interviews showed that the women wanted to keep working even though many would have benefited financially if they left their jobs and went on welfare. The loss of AFDC payments pushed many of the families (between 42 and 79 percent depending on location) into poverty and made poor families even poorer. One significant hardship was the loss, for many women, of Medicaid coverage, leaving them and their children without health insurance (almost two in every five working mothers interviewed in Michigan had no health insurance for their children).

This study and others examining recent AFDC policy changes raise important questions about the wisdom of linking Medicaid eligibility with AFDC eligibility, as well as questions about how to

reward a willingness to work and to encourage self-sufficiency among the working poor. Rather than viewing work and welfare as mutually exclusive, many analysts think the income transfer system should encourage people to connect with the mainstream economy by providing them with medical insurance, child-care subsidies, and other sources of support that they automatically lose when they become ineligible for AFDC. Also, as indicated in the first section of this paper, some working women who head families may need wage subsidies or other forms of income supplementation because they cannot earn enough to support their children.

Since the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act, state governments have had to take on more and more responsibility for designing and implementing social welfare policies. In doing so, they have come up against a lack of data and information on what policies and programs have worked at the state level. The project described below is helping fill that gap.

American Public Welfare Association--The goals of this project are to review promising programs aimed at assisting families headed by women, and to recommend how these programs can be improved or implemented more widely. The analysts are studying four areas: employment and training, child care, child support, and fertility-related care. Findings and recommendations will be presented and discussed at a conference co-sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and then revised and disseminated to public welfare officials, state and federal policymakers, and others. An important audience will be state program administrators, many of whom now seem receptive to rethinking the structure of their programs and trying new strategies.

A more fundamental reform is envisaged by analysts working on another Foundation-supported project. These analysts believe means-tested cash assistance programs for poor children and families like AFDC should be a safety net of last resort for the poor--not, as at present, the first and only defense against poverty. They think the welfare system should be reconceptualized and redesigned so that such programs are not unrealistically charged with remedying a wide variety of social problems better addressed by other programs--for example, those providing education, health services, training and employment, and unemployment insurance.

Center for the Study of Social Policy--The project has these specific objectives: (1) To identify subgroups of the poor according to their differing income needs (instead of treating all people with low incomes as if they required assistance for the same reasons). Some poor people cannot reasonably be expected to work outside the home; some could work full- or part-time; others who are already working full-time require supplemental income. These distinctions are critical if public assistance programs are to be targeted effectively.

(2) To devise a plan for restructuring the entire assistance package so that universal, non-means-tested mechanisms (such as the tax system, Social Security, and unemployment compensation) constitute the primary defense against poverty, and means-tested benefits become supplements, the function for which they were originally conceived. A diverse group of experts will be consulted at all stages as the plan is devised.

(3) To present the realities of poverty and the issues involved in devising alternative assistance policies in ways that are comprehensible to policymakers and the public; too often social welfare issues are discussed in highly technical terms that hinder understanding of the shortcomings of existing programs and the need for reform. Publications, media briefings, and Congressional seminars are drawing attention to the issues.

Relieving welfare and other means-tested programs of responsibility for fulfilling goals they are not well structured to achieve (such as providing incentives for employment) would bring our system closer to the social welfare programs of some other industrialized nations. This approach, which also could help dissipate the attitude that blames the poor for their circumstances and creates an anti-welfare climate, is supported by a diverse group of policy analysts. Designing such a reform to meet acceptable cost, administrative, and political criteria is a major challenge.

Another social welfare policy question of growing interest to the Foundation is that of child support. Finding an equitable and politically acceptable means of ensuring adequate public-sector support for poor children in one-parent households will require policymakers to address the issue of private responsibility for child support.

The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement does provide funds for some research on child support, but that research focuses mainly on administrative procedures and enforcement strategies;

similarly, few private foundations have funded work on the role that child support could play in reducing poverty in single-parent families.

The Foundation's work on this complex, emotional question emphasizes the development and dissemination of knowledge contributing to public education and informed debate. Support has been provided for a working conference that will bring together a small group of international experts from countries that have child-support programs and about twenty federal and state officials of the Child Support Enforcement Program, interested legislative staff, and policy researchers. Participants will explore the relevance of other countries' experience with child-support enforcement and other means of assisting low-income families headed by women. The Foundation is also helping to fund evaluation of an experiment in ten counties in Wisconsin that aims to provide a guaranteed minimum level of support, bases payments on a set percentage of parental income, and makes automatic payroll deductions from the incomes of both parents. The experiment represents a first step toward the use of a universal child or family allowance to supplement low family income independently of public assistance programs.

In the future, the Foundation expects to make grants for additional social welfare research examining the results of welfare reform, both at the program level and in terms of larger structural change. The Foundation also expects to fund attempts to educate the general public about the rights and responsibilities of parenthood and to engage a variety of constituencies in the child-support debate.

Welfare-to-work research demonstrations. The objective of the Foundation's grants in this area has been to develop knowledge about effective public- and private-sector attempts to reduce welfare dependency through various employment strategies.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 gives states considerable discretion in developing work opportunities for AFDC recipients; it promotes, among other options, a mandatory work program, the Community Work Experience Program (CWEP). Under that program, states can require AFDC recipients, as a condition of their

payments, to work in a public or nonprofit agency for a set number of hours per month, which is determined by dividing the family's grant by the minimum hourly wage. A number of states have developed work/welfare initiatives, most frequently on a limited demonstration basis, that include CWEP along with other program options such as job clubs, job-search assistance, pre-employment training, and other education and training programs. A major Foundation grant is supporting study of some of these initiatives.

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)--This large, four-year project is evaluating the feasibility, impact, and cost effectiveness of state welfare-to-work initiatives in eight states that represent diverse programs, locations, and economic conditions: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. In another four states (Florida, New Jersey, Texas, and Vermont), MDRC is studying programs in which private-sector businesses employ people eligible for welfare and pay them, in part, from welfare funds. The research addresses such questions as: Can programs be mounted that are large enough to absorb a substantial share of those eligible for welfare? Can such programs produce useful services and create real jobs? Can they reduce welfare costs? If so, can the savings exceed program costs? In most states the research is using randomly assigned experimental and control groups. The results should provide new data to inform state policy and program development. The Foundation's \$3.6 million grant has been matched by more than \$4.6 million in state, federal, and other private foundation funds.

Data on the relative effectiveness of various welfare-to-work strategies are critical if the debate about work and welfare, which up to now has been largely ideological, is to become more realistic. The available evidence suggests that past "workfare" programs have had difficulty achieving high participation rates, but that evidence is insufficient and the programs from which it was obtained may have been poorly implemented. Because of the urgent need for data, the project described above will continue to be a central focus of the Foundation's program over the next two years.

A major Foundation interest in this area is testing new approaches to fostering the welfare-to-work transition that pool the resources and expertise of organizations that generally have not worked together in the past, such as public-sector training and education systems, labor unions, women's organizations, community

colleges, private businesses, and welfare departments. For this purpose the Foundation has made a grant and a loan to a community development corporation in Maine for the project described below.

Coastal Enterprises, Inc. (CEI)--CEI is helping finance the expansion of small businesses while creating jobs and training opportunities for the disadvantaged. In exchange for a CEI investment, businesses must hire and train disadvantaged people for at least 30 percent of the jobs created with the investment. As an incentive, employers receive tax credits for hiring the disadvantaged and public subsidies for on-the-job training. Welfare funds are also diverted for the training programs. The project brings into partnership an array of parties: the welfare department, the employment and training system, and owners of small businesses. An evaluation of the project will document the process and impact of this economic development strategy; it will also provide useful data to officials in other states who are looking for low-cost ways to help welfare recipients obtain long-term, unsubsidized employment.

The Foundation is also investigating the feasibility of providing more stable employment and career opportunities for low-income home-health-care workers. The home-health-care industry employs many workers who move back and forth between--and sometimes combine--paid employment and various income transfer programs (for example, AFDC payments, food stamps, and unemployment insurance). This "revolving door" phenomenon is particularly common among single mothers, who need jobs providing sufficient income and medical benefits to cover their family's needs but often lack the skills to qualify for more than marginal employment. The Foundation is exploring whether it is possible to devise innovative strategies that would provide for the income needs of workers without raising health-care costs or lowering the quality of the services provided. Results from such experiments might influence how this rapidly expanding field develops over the next decade.

Another strategy the Foundation has pursued within the welfare-to-work area has been to find ways to help low-income women move into traditionally "male" jobs that pay enough to support a family. The barriers to the employment of women in blue-collar and technical jobs have been well documented; they include inadequate enforcement of affirmative action legislation and regulations, lack of

access to apprenticeship programs, insufficient education, and stereotyped ideas of what constitutes "women's work." Several projects funded by the Foundation are attempting to overcome these barriers.

The Corporation for Public/Private Ventures (P/PV)--P/PV is conducting tests in eleven sites of a model known as the Women in Ventures in Community Improvement; in most of the tests the aim is to train disadvantaged women for entry-level jobs in the building and construction trades. The women work to improve the housing in their neighborhoods under the supervision of experienced journeymen. The women receive special support services such as day-care referrals and high school equivalency training. The Foundation's \$600,000 for this demonstration has been matched by about \$5 million in local government support and \$550,000 in funds from other private foundations. P/PV is conducting an extensive evaluation of the model and its impact on participants' employment status and earnings.

MDC, Inc. and the Women's Technical Institute--Employment in high-technology industries seems to hold particular promise for low-income women; in this sector demand is expanding, job mobility is high, and occupational stereotypes may be less rigid than elsewhere. A large proportion of the work force in these industries is female, but women tend to be concentrated in the unskilled jobs. Well-paid technician's jobs are generally held by men. Part of the problem is that the technical training institutes that prepare workers for the higher-paid jobs do not take into account the special training needs of women. The Foundation has made grants for two projects that are training low-income women to qualify for higher-paying technical jobs. The first involves a demonstration to test the capacity of the North Carolina community college system to deliver technical training to disadvantaged women, and the second provides support for the Women's Technical Institute in Boston, an institution that recruits, trains, and places women in electronics, drafting, and other technical jobs.

Attempts to promote the economic independence of women who head families must address the question of child care. As more and more mothers enter the labor force and public support for child-care services shrink, many families cannot find or pay for good child care.

While the federal government is not at present likely to supply more direct support for child care, two current provisions of the tax law do provide indirect support. The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 permits employers to deduct the cost of child-care subsidies for

employees as a business expense. The second and currently largest form of government support for child care is the child-care tax credit, which provides tax credits for parents who purchase child care. However, credit levels are relatively low, and the scheme does not help low-income families because the credit cannot be greater than one's tax liability. An additional but modest federal child-care subsidy permits AFDC recipients to deduct child-care expenses up to \$160 a month per child from their gross earnings.

Given the lack of direct public support for child care and the inability of low-income parents to pay the full costs of such care, a variety of strategies are being devised to stimulate private-sector investment in child care and make it easier for employers to provide child-care subsidies. There is a concern, however, that this "privatized" approach to child care will create a segregated system in which the high-quality programs will be reserved for children of upper-income families while children of the poor will have access only to inferior programs.

As part of this effort, the Foundation is supporting several projects designed to remedy the lack of child-care services and to improve the quality of existing services available to poor mothers. Two of these are described below.

Wellesley College School-Age Child Care Project--This national project provides technical assistance, public information and education, and policy analysis on the care of "latch-key" children, or children who have no one to care for them after school hours. It aims to stimulate a range of after-school services for these children as well as to analyze the barriers preventing children from low-income families from using those services.

National Council of Churches Child Day Care Project--The goals of this program are to develop a national network of church-housed day-care providers, to improve their quality, and to strengthen their financing from both church and secular resources. The network now includes about 15,000 programs.

The Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families estimates that the number of children under age ten living in households headed by women will rise by 48 percent between 1980 and 1990, from 6 million to 8.9 million. Financing care for these children will be a most

challenging task. A recent report from the Select Committee estimates that about one in four mothers with children under six who are not now working would seek employment if they could find affordable child-care services. Strategies designed to promote the movement of these women into the labor force must evaluate a range of possible schemes for providing direct or indirect child-care subsidies to those who need them. Examples of such schemes could include increasing the dependent-care tax credit, developing a subsidized voucher system, providing further tax incentives to employers, stimulating certain lower-cost forms of day care such as family day care, supporting child-care information and referral systems, and expanding Head Start programs. The Foundation expects to devote a modest amount of support to research on these and other approaches to child care for low-income women who want to work.

Helping Teenage Parents and Preventing Teenage Pregnancy

The Foundation has been a prime source of funding for programs for teenage parents across the country, and some of these are now generating interesting results. Despite these successes, however, there are no easy or "good" solutions to the problems created by a teenager's unintentional pregnancy; the individual, social, and fiscal costs are usually high. Thus, while continuing to support programs concerned with young parents, the Foundation has begun to pay more attention to the prevention of unwanted teenage pregnancy.

Pregnant teenagers and teenage parents. The Foundation's program for pregnant teenagers and teenage parents, begun in the late 1970s, was designed to find ways to reduce the negative economic and social consequences of early childbearing, to keep young mothers in school, and to prevent unwanted repeat pregnancies. Since then, the Foundation has granted approximately \$3.7 million to four demonstrations aimed at helping teenage parents become economically self-sufficient.

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)/Project Redirection--Project Redirection is a national research/demonstration project serving pregnant teenagers and teenage

parents without high school degrees who are receiving (or are eligible to receive) AFDC assistance; it is being managed and evaluated by MDRC. The project links participants with community agencies providing education, employability and life-management training, health care, family planning, and other support services. The teenage mother is paired with a mature woman from her community who provides guidance on practical matters and works to strengthen the young parent's commitment to the project's objectives. The project also uses a structured "Individual Participation Plan" to shape the goals and monitor the progress of each participant. Researchers are exploring the applicability, cost effectiveness, and impact of the program in a variety of settings; the impact analysis is comparing outcomes for 450 participants and 450 matched teenagers who have not received special services. Project Redirection is currently operating in three of the original demonstration cities (New York, Phoenix, and Riverside, California) and the model is being replicated, with funds from community foundations, in El Paso, St. Louis, Albuquerque, Atlanta, Cleveland, Greenville (Mississippi), and Brooklyn, New York.

Alliance for Young Families--The alliance consists of about 40 Boston-area health-care and social-service agencies serving adolescent parents. Its Teen Parent Family Support Project has two components: (a) the development and evaluation of a project providing caseworker services and neighborhood-based daytime child care for about 100 low-income teenage mothers and their families; and (b) the analysis of existing services for teenage parents and work with the Massachusetts Department of Social Services to make them more effective and promote their use. Each teenage mother enrolls before her baby is born and agrees that for the next eighteen to twenty-four months she will: (a) continue in school, vocational training, or employment; (b) use a mutually agreed-upon, trained neighborhood woman to care for her child during the day; and (c) receive a home visit from her caseworker every month. Teenagers who participate have no access to family or other sources of child care and are thus those at highest risk for school dropout, child abuse, and additional pregnancies. The project recruits, trains, and supervises low-income women from the teenagers' neighborhoods to provide child care and other kinds of support. The evaluation is comparing participants and a matched group of nonparticipants on a variety of outcome measures such as school enrollment and completion, delay of subsequent births, and physical and psychological well-being.

Child Welfare League of America/MELD Project--This research and demonstration project is testing an educational support-group model that seeks to make teenage mothers more competent and confident parents. "Young Moms" groups, each containing about fifteen teenagers, meet weekly over a two-year period. The

teenagers are enrolled before their babies are born. Each group is led by two volunteer facilitators who, under the supervision of MELD staff, use a MELD curriculum that covers the basics about health, child development, nutrition, educational and vocational planning, sexuality, and use of appropriate social services. The groups are sponsored by a social-service or health-care agency that provides space, child care, food, transportation assistance, medical and social service referrals, and health counseling for group members as needed. The model is being tested in Minneapolis, Cleveland, Toledo, Atlanta, and Charlotte--with four groups at each site. The Child Welfare League is monitoring the demonstration and evaluating its impact on both parents and children.

Urban Affairs Corporation (UAC)/Adolescent Primary Health-Care Center--The UAC is a nonprofit organization in Houston sponsored by local corporations and businesses. This project aims to provide primary health care to students in seven inner-city Houston schools, with emphasis on those considered at high risk for unwanted pregnancy, pregnant students, and teenage parents. Major goals include improving the health of all students in the seven schools, preventing unwanted pregnancies, promoting maternal and infant health, strengthening parent-child interaction, keeping teenage parents in school, and improving employment opportunities for at-risk adolescents. Available in each school are a primary health-care clinic, social-service and psychological counseling, a vocational program, parenting and child-rearing courses, a child development center for the children of students, and a specialized program of prenatal-through-postpartum care for pregnant students. The UAC Board has pledged an eight-year commitment to the project to supplement support from the Ford Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and other foundations.

These four experiments illustrate the major strategies currently being followed in trying to help teenage parents. Because the Foundation has devoted considerable resources to rigorous research, the projects should produce the most authoritative data yet available on the effectiveness of these approaches.

While final research results will not be available before 1985-86, interim reports and observations have yielded some tentative conclusions. These are consistent with findings of the recent evaluation by the Urban Institute of a group of programs funded by the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs (OAPP) in the Department of Health and Human Services. Those findings indicate that--at an average cost of \$3,000 to \$5,000 per teenager--comprehensive programs

for pregnant teenagers and teenage mothers can have a consistently positive, if only modest, effect on the health of the mother and baby, the mother's school enrollment or completion, parenting skills, and avoidance of subsequent unwanted pregnancies.

Delaying second pregnancies seems to be one of the hardest results to achieve: nationwide, from 15 to 23 percent of teenage mothers become pregnant again within twelve months following the birth of their first child. This is particularly troubling because if a teenager with one child has a second baby, she is much less likely to return to school, get a job, and eventually become less dependent on welfare.

Efforts to encourage teenage mothers to continue education, on the other hand, have had some success. While most teenage mothers do not obtain high school degrees, these young women are receiving more education now than in the past; Mott and Maxwell (1981) use national survey data to show that in 1979 more adolescent mothers stayed in school both during their pregnancies and after the birth of their children than was the case in 1968. One reason may be that Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments prohibits schools from expelling or excluding pregnant students. Another may be that less stigma is attached to early childbearing outside of marriage now than in the past. More specifically, the OAPP evaluation referred to above, as well as initial results from Project Redirection and the Alliance for Young Families project, indicate that participants in comprehensive programs for teenage mothers are more likely to enroll in school or other educational programs than young women in matched comparison groups. This result suggests that such programs are cost-effective, since all concerned with problems of teenage pregnancy agree that education has a positive impact on a teenage mother's future employment and earnings; furthermore, continuing education seems to delay subsequent pregnancy.

The reports from programs for teenage parents funded by the Ford Foundation and others are also yielding important lessons about the most effective ways of helping this group. It is clear, for example, that a case-management approach is very useful. Education,

health, income maintenance, and other services are available for teenage parents, but many of these young people need help in obtaining them. A good case manager can make the difference by aggressively seeking the appropriate services, making sure they are of good quality, and seeing that the teenager uses them. These and other program guidelines are summarized in Elizabeth McGee's Too Little, Too Late: Services for Teenage Parents, a Foundation-commissioned review of the field.*

Most programs for teenage parents serve fathers peripherally or not at all, though many intend to do so. There are several reasons for this:

--These programs have limited resources, and their staffs choose to focus those resources on the young mother. Also, teenage mothers generally assume the bulk of responsibility for child-rearing and are more likely than fathers to seek help in obtaining health or social services.

--It is not always clear what sort of involvement with the father is appropriate if the father is no longer seeing the mother or is much older than she or is married. Encouraging involvement with a father whose influence upon the mother is destructive would not be sensible.

--Program staff can harbor feelings of anger toward fathers, who are often seen as irresponsible and unlikely to contribute to family life. Before attempts are made to engage fathers in program activities, the staff must be helped to alter these sentiments if they are not to undermine the effort.

--Most agencies working with teenage mothers are dominated by women, who may not be the most appropriate counselors of young males.

--Many fathers avoid making themselves known to service programs because they cannot pay child support or they fear the disapproval of staff. If the young mother is receiving welfare

* To receive a copy of this publication, which is free, write to the Office of Reports, Ford Foundation, 320 E. 43 St., New York, N.Y. 10017.

payments, she herself may resist having the father participate in a program. She may fear that acknowledging his paternity will jeopardize her support from the state.

Nonetheless, involving teenage fathers in service programs can bring several benefits. First, it may help prevent additional unplanned pregnancies. Too often, young fathers are denied the experience of parenthood. Involving them with their new families confronts them with the results of their sexuality; their babies become real human beings with their own needs. For some, this reality may be a strong deterrent to further unplanned pregnancies.

Second, a good relationship between the father and the child can be important for the emotional and intellectual growth of the child. Programs that teach young men how to care for their children and to relate to them through the various stages of early childhood can help the fathers become more competent and confident parents.

Third, the father's support can benefit the young mother. It can allow her to return to school or work, decrease her social isolation, and help her create a stable environment for the child.

Finally, the young father himself can benefit from counseling, especially when it is coupled with services in education, employment, and skills training. The teenage father who can find a job and contribute, however minimally, to his child's support often experiences great pride in the role of provider, and this pride in turn reinforces his attachment to the child.

The Foundation has made several grants, described below, to learn more about teenage fathers.

Bank Street College of Education/Fatherhood Project--The goal of this project is to determine the best ways of increasing teenage fathers' economic and emotional support of their children, encouraging them to use family planning, and improving their educational attainment and employment status. Various new service models are being tried, in collaboration with community foundations, in Bridgeport, Louisville, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Dutchess County, New York. Bank Street staff are monitoring the programs, providing training and technical assistance as needed, documenting the collaborations and supervising the research, organizing conferences among funders and program operators, and disseminating the results.

University of Minnesota/ Study of Paternity Adjudication and Child Support--This study looks at the implications of paternity adjudication and child-support obligations for teenage parents, with particular emphasis on the question of how to balance the potentially competing interests of teenage mothers, young fathers, their parents, their infants, and the public. The researchers are exploring the legal, ethical, and social aspects of the subject as a basis for generating a report and policy recommendations.

Ethnographic Research--The Foundation is funding several modest studies to document the range of responses to fatherhood exhibited by teenagers, from the uninvolved father to the teenager who wants very much to support and nurture his child despite substantial obstacles; the results should provide understanding of the factors that shape a young man's attitudes and behavior in the areas of sexuality and parenthood.

Looking ahead to new areas of programming for pregnant teenagers and teenage parents, the Foundation believes that, with some exceptions, what is needed now is not more testing of new service models but, rather, support for new ways of coordinating and improving existing services.

While increased attention of private foundations to the problem of teenage pregnancy is encouraging and beneficial, society's capacity to deal effectively with the problem depends in large part on leadership and initiatives from the public sector. Thus, in the future the Foundation will be placing greater emphasis on helping the public sector develop more effective approaches to serving teenage parents.

In the face of limited leadership coming from the federal level, state-level initiatives to develop coordinated policies for pregnant teenagers and teenage parents are now crucial. However, while states are currently spending substantial amounts on AFDC, Medicaid, child-abuse and neglect services, child care, and other services for families created by adolescent childbearing, few have systematic programs for teenage parents, and even fewer have coordinated service delivery plans.

In developing initiatives the states face many problems: a lack of basic planning data, a fragmentation of policies and services, the controversial nature of the teenage pregnancy issue, a lack of

credible independent analyses of state agency policies and practices, and political battles among state agencies over control of funds and programs for this group. The formation of state-level interagency task forces is a step forward, but these bodies often need assistance in identifying policy barriers, formulating recommendations for changes, and implementing recommended policies. Finally, as in the area of welfare reform discussed earlier, mechanisms for sharing experience and knowledge are lacking.

In cooperation with the American Public Welfare Association and the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, the Foundation hosted a two-day meeting in the spring of 1984 for welfare commissioners from fifteen states, at which state interest in and existing programs dealing with teen pregnancy were discussed. Participants agreed that there could be substantial payoff in designing more comprehensive and coordinated service delivery systems that would target resources more effectively and track the impact on adolescent parents over time. The Foundation expects to review a variety of approaches to such coordinated systems. Community-wide teenage pregnancy networks, which are beginning to emerge, as well as partnerships between these networks and the public sector, present especially promising possibilities for future work.

A number of foundations have the problem of teenage pregnancy on their agendas. These include such national institutions as the Hewlett, Mott, and William T. Grant Foundations, the Commonwealth Fund, and the Carnegie Corporation, as well as a number of local and community foundations. The Ford Foundation expects to continue to look for opportunities to stimulate new interest in the problem and to work jointly with other funders. An example of a collaborative effort that has received considerable attention in the foundation world is a project undertaken with fifteen community foundations to replicate Project Redirection and to test new services for teenage fathers.

Prevention of teenage pregnancy. In examining the causes of teenage pregnancy, the first question that needs to be addressed is

why some teenage girls become pregnant and others do not. We do know that, while teenagers of all classes and ethnic backgrounds bear children, the young mothers most often come from families that are poor, have low educational attainment, and live in low-income urban centers or rural areas. But many young women from such families do not bear children in their teenage years, and the diversity among those who do suggests that early childbearing is caused by many factors and its prevention will require many different approaches.

A Foundation-supported study of racial and ethnic differences in adolescent fertility reveals important differences between black and white teenagers in attitudes and practices. Kristen Moore et al. report that in 1980 the birth rate among eighteen- and nineteen-year-olds was nearly twice as high for blacks as for whites; for those age fifteen through seventeen it was nearly three times as high, and for teenagers under fifteen it was more than seven times as high. Blacks initiate sexual activity at an earlier age than whites and are more likely to have had sexual intercourse during the teenage years, more likely never to use contraception, less likely to marry if they have a baby, and less likely to give the child up for adoption if it is born outside marriage. While Moore et al. found that black and white youth had similar educational and occupational aspirations, school dropout and unemployment are substantially higher among black teenagers. In addition, black and white youth differ in their attitudes toward marriage and family. When asked what is the best age to become a parent and the best age to marry, a substantial number (though not the majority) of black teenagers give an earlier ideal age for parenthood than for marriage. Black youth are also far less likely than whites to experience strong condemnation for early childbearing outside of marriage. This, coupled with the fact that marriage is less common among blacks of all ages, is consistent with demographic reality; in 1982, only 42 percent of black children under eighteen were living with two parents (compared with 69 percent of Hispanic children and 81 percent of white children).

As Joy Dryfoos points out (1983), avoidance of pregnancy requires both capacity and desire. The capacity to prevent pregnancy

depends upon knowledge of reproduction and contraception, access to reproductive health services, and the ability to avoid unwanted or exploitative sexual contact and to use contraception effectively. Traditionally, programs to prevent teenage pregnancy have concentrated almost exclusively on giving teenagers the capacity to control fertility through family planning services and sex and family life education.

Such programs have contributed to a reduction in unintended teenage pregnancies (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1983 and 1984). While sexual activity among teenage women increased dramatically during the 1970s, so did contraceptive use, with the result that pregnancies increased by only 12.5 percent during this period. In 1981 an estimated 1.5 million teenagers received family planning services from federally supported clinics, while another 1.4 million received such services from private physicians.

At the same time, however, more than 2.1 million sexually active young women did not receive medical contraceptive care in 1981, and about one-third of these used no contraception at all. Six out of seven teenagers come to family planning clinics after they become sexually active, and most wait almost a year before seeking contraception; thus, family planning clinics have not learned how to attract young people before or soon after they initiate intercourse. If the clinics could reach teenagers earlier, they could have a much more important effect on teenage pregnancy, since almost half of first premarital pregnancies occur in the first six months of sexual activity.

Like family planning services, sex education is significantly more prevalent now than it was in the early 1970s--roughly seven in ten young people receive some sex or family life education before leaving school, and about four in ten participate in a separate sex education course. Experts attempting to assess the impact of this education report that the courses certainly increase knowledge among students, but the evidence of their success in reducing unintended pregnancy is contradictory. (See Zelnik & Kim [1982] and Kirby [1984] for differing conclusions.)

The desire to avoid pregnancy is somewhat more elusive than the capacity to do so. It seems evident, though, that the teenager who understands that her sexual behavior may limit her future options, and who believes her prospects are promising, is likely to want to avoid early pregnancy.

Even when they know about and have access to contraception, teenagers will engage in unprotected intercourse and become pregnant. Why is this so? Some researchers believe those teenagers lack the cognitive and behavioral skills required to use birth control effectively. As Gilchrist and Schinke (1983) note, using birth control requires anticipating sexual encounters, seeking out relevant information, and applying it to one's own behavior; some adolescents prefer to be "swept away" into "spontaneous" sex than to take precautions against pregnancy. Also, young people lack experience in making difficult choices and in handling complex interactions with others. The usual sources to which teenagers turn for guidance--peers, the media, and parents--offer little assistance. Peers are likely to be as confused as they are, the media promote sex constantly but rarely associate it with contraception, and parents generally feel ill-equipped to help their children develop responsible attitudes and behavior on sexual matters.

Other researchers and people who run programs for teenagers think teenagers act irresponsibly out of a general feeling that they are powerless to assume meaningful societal roles. Several recently developed sex-education courses, including one being tested with Foundation support by the Girls Clubs of America, strongly emphasize life planning and the development of skills young people need to set goals for themselves and to act to attain those goals.

In the area of the prevention of teenage pregnancy, the Foundation is following four strategies. The first strategy is to test model family planning and education programs, especially those based in schools, that represent various approaches to prevention. The aim is to inform what is now largely an ideological debate with hard facts about programs that work and can be replicated for large numbers of young people. The three grants described below fall under

this strategy.

Johns Hopkins University--Researchers are evaluating a school/family planning clinic model in which a social worker and nurse practitioner provide educational and counseling services in the school and refer appropriate students to an adjacent family planning clinic which they staff after school hours. This model, being tried in two inner-city schools in Baltimore, is related to the school-based clinic model in Houston described earlier but differs in that the clinic is located on the school premises and provides family planning rather than comprehensive health services.

Grady Memorial Hospital/Emory University--A curriculum designed to help young people develop skills needed to resist the social and peer pressures that lead to early sexual activity is being tried with 15,000 eighth-grade students in the Atlanta Public Schools. Researchers will test the impact of the curriculum on their knowledge, attitudes, and skills as well as birth rates.

Corporation for Public/Private Ventures (P/PV)--P/PV is testing the effectiveness of a modest pregnancy prevention effort embedded in a larger dropout prevention program for fourteen-year-olds one year or more behind grade level. The program combines remedial education with summer work experience. Evaluation of the demonstration should indicate whether teens who perceive that they have a future to protect are more likely to delay childbearing than those with no "agenda" for the future.

The second strategy is to support policy research on teenage pregnancy prevention. An example is a study by the Alan Guttmacher Institute of why rates of teenage pregnancy are low and/or declining in many European countries but not in the United States. Findings from it and many other studies will be reported at an international conference in the spring of 1985 organized, with Foundation support, by the National Academy of Sciences.

The third strategy is to support efforts to disseminate information and stimulate informed debate and action on the subject of teenage pregnancy prevention. The target groups are decision-makers responsible for setting policy on sex education and other preventive approaches, and organizations providing information, technical assistance, and other types of support to front-line service providers and educators.

Education, Training and Research Associates (ETR)--ETR's National Network for Family Life Education is a centralized

source of information and consultation about family life education, instructional materials, and resources.

National Association of State Boards of Education--The association is receiving support for a project to analyze the development and implementation of the mandated family life/sex education program in New Jersey and to offer assistance to state and local school administrators in other states who are interested in adopting school-based sex education programs.

Center for Population Options (CPO)--CPO engages in public policy, media, and training activities aimed at preventing teenage pregnancy. CPO helps agencies serving youth to create prevention programs and address relevant policy issues.

The fourth strategy is to encourage the education of the public about adolescent sexuality, teenage pregnancy, and approaches to reducing unwanted births to teenagers. The Foundation is paying special attention to the messages that the broadcast media deliver on topics related to adolescent sexuality.

National Council for Children and Television--This organization holds seminars for producers, writers, and directors of prime-time television on the problem of teenage pregnancy and its prevention; the goal is to encourage them to incorporate this material into television scripts.

Twin Cities Public Television--The Foundation is providing partial support for a national outreach and awareness campaign to accompany a seven-part series, "Your Children, Our Children," one segment of which deals with parent-child communication about sex.

As for the future, the Foundation expects to continue support for effective preventive programs in the schools. School systems vary a great deal in the importance they give sex education and other teenage prevention activities. There are several reasons some schools may be less active than others--for example, fear of controversy, lack of qualified staff or research, a shortage of information about potentially effective programs.

The Foundation is planning two possible actions in this area. The first builds on what we are learning about the school-based clinic model (described on page 26). Besides serving pregnant teenagers and teenage parents and their children, programs built on this model provide services, on site or by referral, for teenagers at risk of

unwanted pregnancy. The first of these programs, in St. Paul, Minnesota, seems to have significantly reduced pregnancy rates in the target schools and has generated much interest nationally. The Foundation plans to support a meeting of people working in ten to fifteen similar programs at which they will share experience and consider whether a much broader effort is in order. The grant will also provide partial funding for a project at the Center for Population Options to study the programs, analyze their findings, and produce materials to assist in replication.

Second, the Foundation is considering support for a project among urban middle-level schools that have developed promising preventive approaches. The project would draw attention to good programs, enabling them to strengthen and expand their work and to help nearby schools address similar problems. It would also help to convince educators, school administrators, parents, and students that such initiatives should be part of the schools' educational mandate.

The Foundation also intends to pay special attention to strengthening efforts to prevent early childbearing in the black community. A number of black civil rights and social organizations have begun to address this problem with their constituencies, which is a very promising development. The Children's Defense Fund is launching a five-year project to reduce adolescent pregnancy in the black community, which calls for the involvement of a number of black women's and religious organizations in developing and implementing a range of policy goals and actions. The Foundation has recently made a grant to provide partial support to this project, and intends to monitor these and other initiatives and to explore additional ways in which support might be helpful.

Finally, the Foundation will look for opportunities to integrate modest pregnancy prevention components into a range of initiatives for youth--recreational and sports programs, church youth groups, health and social-service programs, and employment training programs (the summer youth program described above is a first effort in this direction). This approach makes prevention activities central to the mandate of a wide range of organizations, rather than confining

them to the family planning clinic or sex education class, and it has the additional advantage of reaching large numbers of young people at relatively modest expense.

Assuring an adequate standard of living for all children, whether they live in one-parent or two-parent families, is a major long-term challenge for this country. It involves reducing the number of families created before the parents are ready to become breadwinners. It also calls for finding ways to help parents provide for their children through a range of services such as education, income assistance, job training, child support, and child care. Responsibility for this assistance rests with government, employers, churches, communities, schools, and the families themselves. At the same time, private philanthropy can contribute by showing which approaches are most successful, by disseminating information about these findings, and by generally informing the debate on how best to counteract the poverty that now significantly impairs future prospects for many of this country's children.

TABLE 1
GROWTH IN FAMILIES HEADED BY WOMEN, 1960-1982

Year	White		Black		Spanish Origin ^{1/}	
	Number (1,000s)	% of Total	Number (1,000s)	% of Total	Number (1,000s)	% of Total
1960	3,305	8.1	889	20.9	*	
1970	4,165	9.0	1,382	28.3	*	
1980	6,052	11.6	2,495	40.3	706	21.8
1982	6,507	12.2	2,734	41.9	767	22.8

^{1/} Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race.

* No data available

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982-83, Table 73;
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money
Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the
United States: 1982. CPR Series P-50, No. 140, Table 18;
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census,
Characteristics of the Population below the Poverty Level:
1980. CPR Series P-60, No. 133, Table 38.

TABLE 2

CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLDS HEADED BY WOMEN BY MOTHER'S MARITAL STATUS,
1970-1982

	<u>1970</u> <u>(millions)</u>	<u>1982</u> <u>(millions)</u>	<u>Change, 1970-1982</u> <u>(percentage)</u>
Divorced	2.3	5.1	+122
Separated	2.3	3.1	+ 33
Never Married	.5	2.8	+431
Widowed	1.4	1.1	- 17

Source: Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, U.S.
Children and Their Families: Current Condition and Recent
Trends, 1983, p.10.

TABLE 3
FAMILIES LIVING BELOW THE POVERTY LINE, 1982

<u>White</u>	<u>Number (thousands)</u>	<u>Poverty Rate (%)</u>
Married Couple	3,104	6.9
Male Head	201	12.2
Female Head	1,813	27.9
Percentage of Poor Families Headed by Women	<u>35.4</u>	
 <u>Black</u>		
Married Couple	543	15.6
Male Head	79	25.6
Female Head	1,535	56.2
Percentage of Poor Families Headed by Women	<u>71.1</u>	
 <u>Spanish Origin</u> ^{1/}		
Married Couple	465	19.0
Male Head	25	17.0
Female Head	425	55.4
Percentage of Poor Families Headed by Women	<u>46.4</u>	

^{1/} Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1982. CPR Series P-60, No. 140, Table 14.

TABLE 4
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME BY FAMILY TYPE, 1982

<u>Family Type</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Spanish Origin</u> ^{1/}
Married Couple	\$26,443	\$20,586	\$19,338
Male Head	21,416	14,661	17,263
Female Head	13,496	7,458	7,436

^{1/}Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1982. CPR Series P-60, No. 140, Table 1.

TABLE 5
CHILDREN BELOW THE POVERTY LINE AS PERCENTAGE OF ALL CHILDREN.

1981

	Percentage in all Kinds of Families	Percentage in Families Headed by Women
<u>White Children</u>		
Under 18 years	14.7	42.7
Under 6 years	16.8	59.1
 <u>Black Children</u>		
Under 18 years	44.9	67.7
Under 6 years	48.6	74.2
 <u>Children of Spanish Origin</u> ^{1/}		
Under 18 years	35.4	67.3
Under 6 years	36.3	74.5

^{1/} Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census,
Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level:
1981, CPR Series P-60, No. 138, Tables 1 and 37.

TABLE 6

CHILD-SUPPORT PAYMENTS AWARDED AND RECEIVED, 1981

		% awarded child- support orders	For Those Awarded Orders Percentage receiving child support	Mean annual support received	Mean total money income
	Number				
(millions)					
All women with children who have absent fathers	8.4	59.0	72.0 ^{1/}	\$2,110	\$11,747
<u>By Marital Status</u>					
Divorced	2.86	80.5	73.8	\$2,220	\$14,230
Remarried	2.20	77.8	66.7	1,909	9,081
Separated	1.55	42.8	79.9	2,374	9,893
Never Married	1.71	14.3	62.9	1,015	5,555
Widowed	.60	--	--	--	--
<u>By Race</u>					
White	5.98	69.2	72.5	\$2,180	\$12,198
Black	2.29	33.8	67.0	1,640	8,849
Hispanic	.63	43.9	65.9	2,068	8,887
<u>By Years of School</u>					
Less than 12 years	2.39	42.9	58.9	\$1,677	\$ 6,869
High school graduate	3.97	63.2	71.7	1,909	10,819
1-3 years of college	1.39	67.9	77.7	2,309	13,255
4 years or more of college	.64	76.6	84.0	3,089	18,973

^{1/} Of this total, 47% received full support and 25% received partial support.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 124. Child Support and Alimony: 1981 (Advance Report). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1983.

TABLE 7

AFDC FAMILIES, RECIPIENTS, AND OUTLAYS, 1940-1984

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Families (thousands)</u>	<u>Number of Recipients (thousands)</u>	<u>Outlays (millions)</u>
1940	349	1,182	\$ 134
1950	644	2,205	552
1955	612	2,214	618
1960	787	2,005	1,001
1965	1,039	4,329	1,660
1970	2,208	8,466	4,853
1975	3,498	11,346	9,221
1979	3,509	10,312	11,069
1980	3,712	10,774	12,475
1982	3,574	10,477	13,119
1984	3,729	10,907	14,340

Source: Social Security Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1981; Monthly Benefits Statistics, January 1982 and January 1984.

TABLE 8

AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY ON AFDC BY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Reason for Beginning AFDC	Percentage of all Persons Beginning AFDC	Expected Length of stay on AFDC (years)
1. Unmarried Woman Had Child		
Age Under 30		
White		
High School Grad.	4.9	4.3
High School Dropout	6.5	6.2
Non-White		
High School Grad.	9.0	7.7
High School Dropout	6.4	10.4
Age Over 30		
White	0.6	6.1
Non-White	<u>3.3</u>	8.5
	30.7	
2. Wife Became Head		
Age Under 30		
White		
High School Grad.	8.1	3.1
High School Dropout	9.3	4.4
Non-White		
High School Grad.	4.9	5.8
High School Dropout	5.3	6.0
Age Over 30		
White		
High School Grad.	4.6	3.6
High School Dropout	5.3	4.9
Non-White		
High School Grad.	1.7	5.0
High School Dropout	<u>4.4</u>	6.5
	43.6	
3. Earnings Fell	11.0	2.9
4. Other Reason	<u>14.6</u>	3.2
	99.9	

Source: Bane, M., & Ellwood, D. "The Dynamics of Dependence: The Routes to Self-Sufficiency." Cambridge, Mass.: Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc., 1983.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Welfare Policy

Bane, M.J., & Ellwood, D.T., "The Dynamics of Dependence: The Routes to Self-Sufficiency." Cambridge, Mass.: Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc., 1983.

_____, "Single Mothers and Their Living Arrangements." Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1984.

Beeghly, L., Living Poorly in America. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983.

Bernstein, B., The Politics of Welfare. New York: Abt Associates, 1982.

Cassey, J. (ed.), The Parental Child Support Obligation: Research, Practice, and Social Policy. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1982.

Center for the Study of Social Policy, A Dream Deferred: The Economic Status of Black Americans. Washington, D.C.: CCSP, 1983.

_____, The 'Flip-Side' of Black Families Headed by Women: The Economic Status of Black Men. Washington, D.C.: CCSP, 1984.

_____, Working Female-Headed Families in Poverty. Washington, D.C.: CCSP, 1984.

Children's Defense Fund, American Children in Poverty. Washington, D.C.: CDF, 1984.

Cole, S., et al., "Poverty and Welfare Reciprocity after OBRA: Some Preliminary Evidence from Wisconsin." Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, 1983.

Comptroller General of the United States, An Overview of the WIN Program: Its Objectives, Accomplishments, and Problems. Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1982.

Duncan, G., Years of Poverty, Years of Plenty. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1984.

Farley, R., & Bianchi, S., "The Growing Gap Between Blacks." American Demographics, 1982, 5, 14-18.

Garfinkel, I., & Uhr, E., "A New Approach to Child Support." Public Interest, 1984, 75, 111-122.

Glaser, G. Wealth and Poverty. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
_____, "Child Allowances: Out of the Welfare Trap." Wall Street Journal, September 22, 1983, p. 28.

Glick, P., "How American Families Are Changing." American Demographics, 1984, 6, 20-25.

Goodwin, L., Causes and Cures of Welfare: New Evidence on the Social Psychology of the Poor. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1983.

Hess, B., "New Faces of Poverty." American Demographics, 1983, 5, 26-31.

Joe, T., Profiles in Poverty: Effects of the FY 1983 Budget Proposals on the Poor. Washington, D.C.: Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1982.

The Johnson Foundation, Inc., "Welfare Policy in the United States." Racine, Wisconsin: The Johnson Foundation, Inc., 1982.

Kahn, A., & Kamerman, S., Income Transfers for Families with Children. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.

Levitan, S., Programs in Aid of the Poor for the 1980s. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Levitan, S., & Johnson, C., Beyond the Safety Net. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1984.

Lopes, M., & View, J., Women and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1983.

Miller, D., "AFDC: Mapping a Strategy for Tomorrow." Social Service Review, 1983, 57, 599-613.

Moscovice, I., & Craig, W., "The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act and the Working Poor." Social Service Review, 1984, 58, 49-66.

O'Neill, D., "Living Standard Standards." American Demographics, 1983, 5, 40-41.

Ozawa, M., Income Maintenance and Work Incentives. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

Pearce, D., & McAdoo, H., Women and Children: Alone and in Poverty. Washington, D.C.: National Advisor, Council on Economic Opportunity, 1981.

Rainwater, L., "Stigma in Income-Tested Programs." In I. Garfinkel (ed.), Income-Tested Transfer Programs. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Rein, M., Dilemmas of Welfare Policy: Why Work Strategies Haven't Worked. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

Sanger, M., "Generating Employment for AFDC Mothers." Social Service Review, 1984, 58, 28-48.

Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, Demographic and Social Trends: Implications for Federal Support of Dependent-Care Services for Children and the Elderly. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984.

Usher, C., & Griffith, J., "The 1981 AFDC Amendments and Caseload Dynamics." North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, 1983.

Watts, H., Jakubson, G., & Skidmore, F., "Single-Parent Households under Alternative Transfer and Tax Systems." In I. Garfinkle (ed.), Income-Tested Transfer Programs. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Weitzman, L., "The Economics of Divorce: Social and Economic Consequences of Property, Alimony and Child Support Awards." UCLA Law Review, 1981, 28, 1181-1268.

White, R., & Weidman, J., Assessment of a WIN Quality Training Demonstration Program. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1983.

Teenage Pregnancy

Alan Guttmacher Institute, Teenage Pregnancy: The Problem That Hasn't Gone Away. New York: Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1981.

_____, "What Government Can Do About Teenage Pregnancy." Issues in Brief, 1984, 4, 1-4.

_____, "School Sex Education in Policy and Practice." Issues in Brief, 1983, 3, 1-6.

Blum, B., "Helping Teenage Mothers." Public Welfare, 1984, 42, 17-21.

Branch, A., & Quint, J., Project Redirection: Interim Report on Program Implementation. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1981.

Burt, M., et al., Helping Adolescents: Outcomes and Costs of Service Delivery. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1984.

Center for Public Advocacy Research, Services for Sexually Active, Pregnant and Parenting Adolescents in New York City: Planning for the Future, Volume I. New York: CPAR, 1982.

Dryfoos, J., "A New Strategy for Preventing Unintended Teenage Childbearing." Family Planning Perspectives, 1984, 16, 193-195.

_____. "Review of Interventions in the Field of Prevention of Adolescent Pregnancy." Preliminary Report to the Rockefeller Foundation, October 1983.

Gilchrist, L., & Schinke, S., "Teenage Pregnancy and Public Policy." Social Service Review, 1983, 57, 307-322.

Kirby, D., Sexuality Education: An Evaluation of Programs and Their Effects. Arlington, Va.: Mathtec, Inc., 1984.

McAnarney, E. (ed.), Premature Pregnancy and Parenthood. New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc., 1982.

Miller, S., Children as Parents. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1983.

Mitchell, K., & Valentine, J., A Study of Eight Comprehensive Educational Programs for Pregnant and Parenting Teens in Massachusetts. Boston: Alliance for Young Families, 1983.

Moore, K., & Burt, M., Private Crisis, Public Cost: Policy Perspectives on Teenage Childbearing. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1982.

Moore, K., Simms, M., & Betsey, C., Information, Services, and Aspirations: Race Differences in Adolescent Fertility. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1984.

Mott, F., & Maxwell, N., "School-Age Mothers; 1968 and 1979." Family Planning Perspectives, 1981, 13, 287-292.

Polit, D., et al., School, Work and Family Planning: Interim Impacts in Project Redirection. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1983.

Sonenstein, F., et al., "Adolescent Parent Support Programs, Are They Worth It?" Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Research Conference of the Association for Public Policy, Analyses and Management, October 1982.

Sonenstein, F., & Pittman, K., "The Availability of Sex Education in Large City School Districts." Family Planning Perspectives, 1984, 16, 19-25.

Tendler, D., Services to Teen Mothers in New York City. New York: Community Council of Greater New York, 1982.

Valentine, J., & Marx, F., Educational Attainment Among School-Age Mothers: A Review of the Literature and Implications for Policy. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1981.

Zelnik, J., & Kim, Y., "Sex Education and Its Association with Teenage Sexual Activity, Pregnancy and Contraceptive Use." Family Planning Perspectives, 1982, 14, 117-126.